

H.R. 3460 is entitled as I say, the "Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act." The author of the bill suggests that we need not worry about an abrupt early publication of patent applications if domestic or foreign or multinational corporations steal the ideas; the patent applicants, once he or she gets the patent issued, can sue the pirates. Like I say, it is Toshiba versus John Q. American citizen. The price tag on this simple infringement suit, by the way, is a quarter of a million dollars, a quarter of a million dollars for just an uncomplicated suit. Our citizens who will be up against Toshiba, Sony, and even the Chinese People's Liberation Army, which is engaged in stealing our technology.

As this bill was being passed through subcommittee, I was in my office with the president of a medium-sized solar energy corporation. When I asked what would happen if this provision became law, he clenched his fist and angrily predicted his Asian competitors would be manufacturing his new technology before his patent was issued, and they would use the profit from selling his new technology to defeat any court challenge that they had and destroy his company. On top of that, his overseas competitors would have a further advantage in the fact that they would never have had to invest in research and development to get the new technology they were benefiting from.

This is a nightmare that faces every small- and medium-sized company. Anyone who cannot afford a stable of expensive lawyers is at the mercy of the worst thieves of the world. The big guys have the contacts overseas and the money to divert and deter such thievery, but it is open season on the little guys, on the average Americans. Of course, we will do everything we can to prevent this bill, but what is their goal?

They say we have to do everything, we have to go, we have to destroy the American patent system, we have to make all of our technological secrets known to the world in order to protect us from submarine patents. Because a few people want to elongate the system on their patent and they will get 5 or 10 years more protection here, a few Americans, so we have to open up our system to this type of massive theft. I would suggest that maybe we should think about the arguments about the submarine patent argument.

What they are telling us, it is sort of like you are going in to your doctor and saying, doctor, I got a hang nail here on this toe and it is really hurting me. The doctor says, I really am opposed to hang nails. Those hang nails are terrible and we are going to solve your problem. We are going to cut your leg off, we are going to amputate your leg.

No, no, doctor, please. I just got this little hang nail down here. He says, I bleed for you, and he goes into a big lecture on hang nails, and at the end of it he says, well, we are going to cut

your leg off. Well, if your doctor is telling you that to cure a hang nail, that he is going to amputate your leg, I think you better question your doctor's motives or maybe your doctor's sanity if he is trying to do that on you.

Another major provision in H.R. 3460, it is the abolition of the Patent Office. That is right, H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, will abolish America's Patent Office. Now, it is in our Constitution. Ben Franklin saw to that. Thomas Jefferson saw to that. It has played a vital role in protecting our property rights ever since then, yet now H.R. 3460 will separate the Patent Office from our Government, limiting congressional oversight. That means those of us who have been elected to represent the interest of the people will not have the same oversight after the Moorhead-Schroeder Act passes. It will remake the Patent Office into sort of a corporate-like private corporation-government corporation, sort of like the post office.

Now, I am in favor of privatizing services when government does not have to do that, but this is a core function of our Federal Government. Protecting the rights of our people as we head into an era of technology, that is even more important. But we need the government to make sure of that. Who is there to determine and protect the intellectual property rights of our people? That is their core function all the way back since 1784.

Well, along with corporatizing and taking away our congressional oversight, the civil service protection for our patent examiners will be stripped from them. It is like stripping the judge's robes off of him, and basically the patent examiners make judicial decisions that will affect billions of dollars worth of ownership in our society. It is the quasi-judicial decisions, and under this bill, they are not going to have any more civil service protection. It opens up our system to outside influences and to corruption that we have never had before. Taking away the civil service protection is a travesty, and these people who work at the Patent Office try their best, and even when they are protected, it is a hard job.

If our Patent Office is corporatized, the head of the Patent Office, Bruce Lehman, Mr. Harmonize Our Laws With Japan, can make the changes he and his board of directors want with limited congressional scrutiny and recourse. Thus, in the coming era of technology and creativity, we basically will be decoupling the protection of patent rights from our Government, cutting off this congressional oversight, and leaving it in the hands of an autonomous board of unelected officials.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to be on that board? Whose special interests will be represented on that board overseeing the decisions as to who owns what technology in the future? Maybe they won't even be people who have allegiance to the United States, who

knows. But they will be making the decisions, and we do not know who they are.

H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, must be defeated. My bill, H.R. 359, the Patent Rights Restoration Act, can be substituted in its place when it comes to the floor of Congress for a vote. The choice is our choice as the American people, as Members of Congress. It is H.R. 3460, the Moorhead-Schroeder Patent Act or the Rohrabacher substitute. One might ask why has a bill that is so obviously detrimental to America's interests, why has it gone this far? First and foremost, and this is a problem we talked about earlier, our big businesses have bought off on the idea of a world economy, and if harmonizing our patent rights is part of that deal with a global economy and even if our foreign competitors renege later, we must change our laws now as a sign of good faith to get everybody working together. This mindset is a great threat to the well-being of the American people.

Second, let me say these huge corporations have enormous influence on Members of Congress. Your biggest corporation in your district comes to see you, the president of that corporation, you listen to that head of that corporation. But these corporate leaders are not representing the interests of their own working people, much less the greater constituency of the people of the United States. These corporate leaders may have good hearts and may be well intended, but they are wrong headed when it comes to globalization. Their loyalty should be in the long term with the people of the United States. Instead, what we find here are people who basically bought into an idea, we are going to create a whole new world, and it is going to be a more perfect world where commerce is flowing.

Watch out, Mr. and Mrs. America, when you run into somebody who is going to change the whole world and make it so much better, even at the expense of the American people and our rights. That is the threat we face today, and right after the Fourth of July when this bill comes to the floor, H.R. 3460, the Steal American Technologies Act, has to be defeated and the Rohrabacher substitute should take its place.

□ 1600

#### ECO-SANITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well of the House here to talk about the environment. I think as the election process starts this year, we are going to hear many elected officials talk about the environment and they will say one party is destroying

the environment and the other party will say we are not destroying the environment. One party will talk about its record and the other party will talk about its record. So I thought it would be good to put in perspective some of the recent literature on eco-sanity, is what I call it, the ability to talk about the environment in terms of common sense.

Most of what I will be talking about today, Mr. Speaker, comes from a book by that exact title, "Eco-Sanity: A Common-Sense Guide to Environmentalism," published by the Heartland Institute. The authors are Joseph Bast, Peter Hill, and Richard Rue.

Now, one of the questions a lot of people ask, particularly back in the district, is can we not spend more Government money to solve this problem? Why can the Government not protect the environment and why can the Government not be the sole provider of this protection?

Well, as many of you know, in 1962 there was a book published called "The Silent Spring." That is roughly 34 years ago, and that started the environmental movement. Until that point we have always relied upon the Government to stop pollution, to safeguard human health, and to protect the wildlife, and we have always thought, well, why can we not just spend more money so that we can protect the environment?

Well, if we go about giving immunizations, as we generally do; if we look at the cost per deaths averted because of this, it might be for diphtheria, \$87, cost per death avoided. But, when we start to move up the chain here, for example, improving traffic signs, that is roughly \$21,000 cost per death averted. Let us move a little higher up and go to breast cancer screening. That is \$160,000 cost per death averted. But then if we go to the hazardous waste land disposal ban, that is roughly \$4.2 billion. Now, that is pretty expensive for the cost per one death.

Now, we can move even further up and we go to hazardous waste listing for wood preserving chemicals. Do you know what that cost, Mr. Speaker, to avert one death. That would cost \$5.7 trillion. So you can see the Government cannot be expected to stop all environmental problems. So we must come up with a solution, and that is what Republicans try to do.

So heavy is this reliance that many environmentalists measure the movement's progress by the strictness of Government-enforced air and water pollution standards, the amount of land placed under Government control, and the number of plants and animals given protected status under the Government-enforced Endangered Species Act. Is that the criteria we want to use, particularly in light of some of these astronomical figures that we see now in this book to try to prevent one death and how much cost the Government will have to spend?

Remember, Mr. Speaker, when we do that we have to go out and tax the American public to do this. So is there another way? Is there another sound, commonsense approach here that we can get to solve this problem? I think there is and this is what brought me to the House floor today. I believe that there is a way to protect the environment and to do it without huge enormous litigation costs, without a huge amount of Government-run bureaucracies.

In fact, I do not think we have to solve the problem by another bureaucratic Government agency. It is unlikely, for example, that reduction in air and water pollution would have occurred as quickly in the absence of Government regulations, and I think that is true, to a certain extent Government is required, or for landfill safety. But these victories often came at much too high a price.

As I mentioned earlier, billions were spent on litigation, footdragging, focusing on the wrong problem. Behind these victories, too, were conspicuous failures. Let us not forget this. Below-cost logging sales, farm and ranching subsidies, Superfund.

How many of us have not been on the House floor to talk about the huge amount of litigation involved with Superfund, and yet we have still so many sites around the United States that are still clogged with these toxic chemicals. I have one in my district. We spent so much money and put up a huge trust fund and most of the money has gone for litigation.

Many feel that the Endangered Species Act has not worked to the benefit of all of us. In fact, when you lay off 30,000 people for one endangered species, you have to question is there some way to solve this problem without more Government bureaucracy. And that is what I am here to say; that we can offer a way. Through the markets, through incentives, through property owner rights enforcement, and by making choices, we can move forward through the channel of politics to results where environmental protection is provided for all our citizens.

This leads me to really the main reason I came on the House floor, is to talk about the rules for eco-sanity. The biggest barrier to further improvements in the environment quality is not a lack of money, even though you hear many people on this side of the aisle saying we need to spend more and more money. In fact, the President of the United States has said we need to spend vast amounts, more money to improve the environment.

Spending on environmental protection in the United States is greater both in dollar terms and as a percentage of gross domestic product than it has ever been before, also considerably higher than spending in many other countries. Our biggest problem is that it is in the politics. We think we have good men in the White House, both Republicans and Democrats. We have

good people on the House floor. So we really cannot say that it is any one individual or perhaps any one type of committee or subcommittee or administration.

What then is the biggest barrier to improving environmental protection? Mr. Speaker, I think it is the environmental movement itself. More specifically, I believe that the lack of understanding and critical thinking on the part of most environmentalists has compromised the movement's ability to be an effective force for real true environmental protection.

Many environmentalists do not think clearly about the issues, relying instead on environmental organizations to do their thinking for them. This trust has been rewarded with campaigns against crises that do not exist and supporting policies that are clumsy, expensive, and sometimes counterproductive.

Similarly, environmentalists have said let the Government do it, and then they fail to pay attention to what the Government actually does. A closer look reveals the Government's record on the environment is a poor one, and that Government often suffers from perverse incentive structures and information blackouts that render it unreliably an ally of the movement.

So I wish to put into the RECORD some of these rules for eco-sanity, which I think is a little bit beyond the popular wisdom on some of the issues, and I think there has been a disconnect by the movement on some of these things that Republicans have done in Congress, and particularly when we try to relax some of the rules and regulations that cities and small towns have so that they can actually inspect for the toxic waste materials that are in their water instead of doing the entire EPA list. This list is so extensive that they have very little money left to really try to identify the toxic waste that is in that particular community, which is indigenous to that community.

So we need to look at some way to equip ourselves to understand if we have a problem here and rules of critical thinking. So with the help of this book I will put into the RECORD the first rule of critical thinking in the eco-sanity debate.

The first one, Mr. Speaker, is correlation is not causation. Now, this sounds a little complicated, but let us take it a little further. Correlation means that two things tend to happen at the same time. Causation means one thing is known to cause another thing. Just because two things happen at the same time does not mean one is causing the other. We need proof, including a reasonable theory, showing the path by which one thing causes another to occur.

Mr. Speaker, these are many environmental scares, including global warming. Remember now last winter we had the most severe winter we have had in Washington, DC, in many years. There

has been so much talk about electromagnetic fields and dioxin. They resulted in the correlation of two things which are mistaken. To avoid future errors we need to challenge people who rely on correlations to prove that one thing is actually causing another thing to happen.

The second rule of critical thinking for eco-sanity is not everything can be explained. The truth is in 1994 that the causes of most specific cases of cancer, miscarriage, and child deformity in the United States are unexplained. We have no idea why it occurs. We simply do not know whether a specific case of brain cancer, for example, is due to a genetic condition, nutrition, alcohol, or drug abuse, and we can go round and round in circles and pointing the blame and asking for more Government regulations and more spending, but not everything can be explained. We have to recognize that fact.

While we should sympathize with the victims of these afflictions, we should not confuse them with experts on the cause of these illnesses. A victim's guess is no more reliable and maybe less reliable than the guesses of many other nonexperts. Someday the work of all these professionals and other scientists may produce the answers we seek, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that day has yet arrived. So the second rule of critical thinking is not everything can be explained.

No. 3, trends cannot predict the future. What I as an individual do today, lots of times the environmentalists will project that out and that might not be right. During the 1970's global temperatures fell several years in a row, and, remember, experts like Dr. Steven Schneider predicted a new ice age. Well, during the 1980's temperatures rose several years in a row and the experts, including Mr. Schneider, predicted catastrophic global warming.

So, first of all, we had the ice age that was predicted in the 1970's, and then we had this global warming where we are going to have the polar caps melt, and, of course, half of North America would be under the water. And they predicted this based upon predicting the future and certain trends. The cold winter of this year, and, of course, the cold winter of 1993-94 prompted Time Magazine, think about this, Time Magazine and some scientists warned of an approaching ice age.

These predictions, along with the prediction of a population explosion and eventual resource depletion, were wrong because they were based upon projection of past trends. And, in fact, the population in the United States has more or less normalized. It is not going up at the projection many people said. So at this point trends cannot necessarily predict the future.

The fourth rule of critical thinking and rules for eco-sanity are facts count for more than opinions. Now that might sound a little strange but it is the truth. A person with the loudest voice sometimes is heard above every-

body else, or he or she might have the most controversial opinion. That person gets the attention on the 6 o'clock news. This is certainly true in the environmentalist movement where there are claims of impending environmental issues.

A few numbers tell us more than 1,000 pictures. For example, the destruction of the world's rain forests changed from a crisis to a manageable problem once we recognized that rain forests are being diminished at a rate of well under 1 percent a year. Similarly, plastic containers moved to the bottom of our agenda when we learned they constitute less than 1.5 percent of the solid waste in a typical landfill. Yes, we all have heard about the plastic containers.

No. 5 rule for eco-sanity is do not forget the past. All common sense things here, Mr. Speaker. During the 1970's many prominent environmentalists predicted an energy crisis, energy crisis in the 1980's and energy crisis in the 1990's and this huge population explosion. Well, some 25 years later oil reserves have grown and population growth is slowing.

Ronald Bailey, a scientist commenting on Paul Erlich and Lester Brown, the environmentalists, say quote,

One reason such apocalyptic abuses thrive is that the public has no longer-term memory. People are unlikely to remember that a doomster made a dire prediction 20 years ago that has since proved absolutely false.

Bailey is right. We need to remember yesterday's false alarms and who sounded them if we are to respond correctly to future calls to action. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, here in Congress we should start keeping track of all these doomsters and all these predictions from the people who say we will have an energy crisis or a population explosion, to all these different problems that they talk about.

No. 6 in the rule of eco-sanity: We can never avoid risk completely. And this is one of the things that Republicans are trying to say, is we have choices. There can never be an absolutely pure, theoretically, absolutely safe situation. Everything we do carries with it a risk. When I came up to Washington on the airplane it carried a risk. When I drove over here or when I walk on the curb there is a risk; even common activities such as a bath, you can drown; crossing a street, being hit by a car. Seemingly harmless things like balloons and toothpicks sometimes can kill people.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as a product, decision, or action that carries no risk whatsoever. So when someone tells us hold on, there may be a risk that a chemical, nuclear plant, or landfill will endanger our health, we should not be frightened. Instead we should calmly ask, how much risk is there? If the risk is unknown, we should wait until reliable evidence is available for us to estimate the risk. If

the risk is 1 in a million, the level of risk often found for things like incinerator fumes and pesticides, it may not be worth attempting to reduce it or spending enormous amounts of government money or setting up another government bureaucracy to do so. It may be a case to study and maybe we can find other ways, but in the end it may not be worth the cost to attempt to stop it any further.

Keep in mind, that is one in a million risk. Keep in mind that the risk of drowning is 16 in a million. So you have a chance or, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the risk of drowning is 16 in a million whereas the risk from pesticide is 1 in a million.

How about dying in an accident in the home; that is 90 in a million or dying in an automobile accident is 192 in a million, greatly exceeds the alleged environmental risk being decryd by some organizations. So if you keep those statistics in mind, you realize that we do not have to set up another government bureaucracy just to handle some of these things because 1 in a million can be a very low risk.

The last rule for ecosanity is rule No. 7, we have to make choices. We cannot buy two items in the grocery store with the same amount of money. We have to choose one or the other. The same, Mr. Speaker, is true of how we clean the environment. We have to choose among many different ways to do it. We cannot do everything at once, because trying to do so would be extremely wasteful, unnecessarily injure many people, and probably produce unintended consequences that harm the environment.

Instead we must apply the same prudence that we apply to other parts of our lives, because the law of diminishing returns, a zero discharge policy would cost huge, huge sums of money and produce very little benefit. That, on this side of the aisle, we are trying to do, to understand the zero discharge, to understand what amount of moneys are required, what is at risk, and what benefit will be produced.

We must, and here is the key word, Mr. Speaker, we must prioritize threats to the environment and find efficient ways to address these threats. The more carefully we do these, the more threats we will be able to successfully address.

The importance of environmental issues does not somehow exempt them from this discipline. In fact, their importance makes careful planning and efficiency all the more necessary.

I would conclude by saying, we on this side of the aisle are trying to bring a new idea to the environmental movement. We have had 36 years of more Government spending, more Government bureaucracies and at this point we realize there is a way to solve this without taxing the American people. That way is, of course, to bring some semblance to this environmental debate with ecosanity. Ecosanity is basically going to help us understand how

to attack these problems and what in the end would be the best thing, best way to solve the problem.

I would conclude by pointing out that if people own a property, that leads to better stewardship. We tend to take better care of things we own than things we rent or borrow. And if the Government and local community would enforce some of the already existing laws on the books, we should be able to bring the ownership and better stewardship and government compliance all together. Because in the end, incentives are better than commands. People are more apt to do things if you give them incentives rather than commands out of Washington. We think that through ownership and incentives, pollution problems can be reduced and we should clearly define the rights of property owners, clearly define what the Government is supposed to enforce and not have this vague set of books where the rules and enforcement are so vague that the actual citizen has no idea how to comply with the rules.

I think the rules to air, water, and wildlife can be defined and I think they can be enforced so when you bring in the clear definition of these rules, you bring in the idea of ownership being better stewardship; incentives are better than command, I think pollution can, in the end, be diminished.

Also we need to understand that when you set up government programs, they suffer in themselves. They are like a black hole. They require more money and sometimes the Government will act with improper knowledge. If we abide by a set of rules for ecosanitary, I think we can prevent that.

Also I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes Government subsidies cause waste. When you have the Government involved spending this money, it sometimes creates less efficiency and leads to greater pollution because in the end if you do not have the efficiency, you cannot have less pollution. Of course, I would conclude by saying the media gives false alarms by extensive publicity, as I point out. A good example is in the area of the energy crisis as well as talking about overpopulation. So all of us need to be aware of stories that come out of the media when, in fact, if we obey these seven rules of ecosanitary, we can have a better understanding how to cope. We need to understand and not react out of fear. Mr. Speaker here is a common-sense agenda for further protecting and improving the environment.

#### TERMINATION OF SUSPENSIONS UNDER FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT WITH RESPECT TO ISSUANCE OF LICENSES TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-236)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FUNDERBURK) laid before the House the following message from the President

of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by Section 902(b)(2) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (P.L. 101-246) ("the Act"), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to terminate the suspensions under section 902(a) of the Act with respect to the issuance of licenses for defense article exports to the People's Republic of China and the export of U.S.-origin satellites, insofar as such restrictions pertain to the Hughes Asia Pacific Mobile Telecommunications project. License requirements remain in place for these exports and require review and approval on a case-by-case basis by the United States Government.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 23, 1996.

#### REPORT ON REVISED DEFERRAL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-237)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral of budgetary resources, totaling \$7.4 million. The deferral affects the Social Security Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 24, 1996.

#### Contents of Special Message

[In thousands of dollars]

Deferral No. and Item	Budgetary resources
D96-2A—Social Security Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses .....	7,365
Total, deferral .....	7,365

#### SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT—REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 1014(c) OF PUBLIC LAW 93-344

This report updates Deferral No. D96-2, which was transmitted to Congress on October 19, 1995.

This revision increases by \$44,285 the previous deferral of \$7,320,543 in the Limitation on administrative expenses, Social Security Administration, resulting in a total deferral of \$7,364,828. This increase results from the deferral of additional carryover of funds from FY 1995 that cannot be used in FY 1996.

DEFERRAL OF BUDGET AUTHORITY  
REPORT PURSUANT TO SECTION 1013 OF P.L. 93-344  
Agency: Department of Health and Human Services.  
Bureau: Social Security Administration.  
Appropriation title and symbol: Limitation on administrative expenses<sup>1</sup> 75X8704.

<sup>1</sup> This account was the subject of a similar deferral in FY 1995 (D95-6A).

OMB identification code: 20-8007-0-7-651.

Grant program: No.

Type of account or fund: No-Year.

New budget authority .....	<sup>2</sup> 167,000,000
Other budgetary resources .....	<sup>2</sup> 261,623,563

Total budgetary resources .....	<sup>2</sup> 428,623,563
Amount to be deferred: Entire year .....	<sup>2</sup> 7,364,828
Legal authority (in addition to sec. 1013): Antideficiency Act.	

Type of budget authority: Appropriation.

Justification: This account includes funding for construction, renovation, and expansion of Social Security Trust Fund-owned headquarters and field office buildings. In addition, funds remain available for costs associated with acquisition of land in Colonial Park Estates adjacent to the Social Security Administration complex in Baltimore, Maryland. The Social Security Administration has received an approved FY 1996 apportionment for \$50,000 to cover potential upward adjustments of prior-year costs related to field office roof repair and replacement projects. The remaining funds will not be needed for obligation in FY 1996. This deferral reflects the actual amount available for construction in FY 1996, less than \$50,000 apportioned for potential upward adjustments in FY 1996. This action is taken pursuant to the Antideficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1512).

Estimated program effect: None.

Outlay effect: None.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 21, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Friday, June 21, 1996 at 10:30 a.m.: That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2803.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE, Clerk.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRBACHER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HASTERT, for 5 minutes each day, on today and June 25, 26, 27, and 28.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each day, on June 25, 26, and 27.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes each day, on June 25, 26, and 27.

<sup>2</sup> Revised from previous report.